The Promise of Quantum Simulation

Richard P. Muller* and Robin Blume-Kohout†
Center for Computing Research, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 87185-1322

Quantum simulation promises to be one of the primary application of quantum computers, should one be constructed. This article briefly summarizes the history quantum simulation in light of the recent result of Wang and coworkers demonstrating calculation of the ground and excited states for a HeH+ molecule, and concludes with a discussion of why this and other recent progress in the field suggests that quantum simulation of quantum chemistry has a bright future.

arXiv:1507.06035v1 [quant-ph] 22 Jul 2015

In 1982, the physicist Richard Feynman noted that it is very hard for a classical computer to simulate some quantum mechanical systems – but that if "the computer itself be built of quantum mechanical elements which obey quantum mechanical laws" [1], then the simulation would become far easier. With this suggestion, Feynman inaugurated the field of quantum computing, and introduced the idea that quantum computers change the boundaries of computational complexity.

Simulation of quantum physical systems is thus the first "killer app" of quantum computing. Since then, several other fast quantum algorithms have emerged, notably Peter Shor's algorithm for integer factorization and discrete logarithms [2] and Lov Grover's algorithm for unstructured search [3]. But quantum simulation remains one of the primary applications of a quantum computer, should one be constructed. It is arguably the most intriguing and potentially valuable of all the known quantum algorithms, with potential impact in chemistry [4], materials science [4], and elementary particle physics [5].

The canonical quantum simulation algorithm uses the same subroutine as Shor's integer factorization algorithm – the quantum Fourier transform – but instead of using it to reveal the period of a modular function, simulation uses it to estimate the energies of a Hamiltonian. It does this using Kitaev's algorithm for quantum phase estimation [6], which efficiently reveals the phase (and thus the eigenvalue), of an eigenvector of a unitary operation. Abrams and Lloyd [7, 8] showed that a broad class of Hamiltonians could be efficiently simulated (and thus probed using phase estimation) using a Suzuki-Trotter expansion. They applied their results to the Hubbard model and suggested that these techniques would lead to an exponential speed-up over classical computing resources. Somma and coworkers [9] extended quantum simulation to many more systems by showing that the Jordan-Wigner transformation [10] could be used to map the creation/annihilation operators that often define quantum mechanical Hamiltonians into N-qubit operators. This paved the way for quantum simulation of quantum chemistry.

Quantum chemistry addresses the problem of describing the electronic structure of molecules and materials, which provides information about how they dissociate, react, absorb light, and interact with other molecules and materials. Typically, quantum chemical methods describe molecular electronic states as products of single-electron states generated from a variety of effective Hamiltonians, including Hartree-Fock [11] and density functional theory [12, 13]. A huge variety of interesting chemical systems are well-described either by these product states or by simple perturbations of them. However, these methods break down in systems involving strongly correlated electrons. For these molecules, quantum chemists fall back on brute force methods, the most accurate (and arduous) of which is full configuration interaction (CI) [14].

Full CI considers the many-body Hamiltonian formed by all the possible ways of distributing N electrons into M one-electron states. Because the number of such configurations grows combinatorially with N and M, full CI computations require [classical] computational resources that scale exponentially with the molecule's size. This kind of scaling rapidly surpasses the capacity of any existing computer, and so quantum chemists have developed a variety of "truncated" approximations to full CI. Typically, these involve configurations that can be generated using just a few excitations from the ground state electronic configuration. Unfortunately, although truncated CI wave functions can be evaluated with only polynomial resources, they are known to lack properties, such as size consistency [15], that are required for quantitative chemical predictions. Related perturbational approaches, such as coupled-cluster approaches [16], include size consistency, but often lack strict variational bounds on the energy. So, although both truncated CI and coupled cluster methods often give excellent energies in practice, they are incomplete solutions to chemical simulation because they lack certain properties of the full CI method. For the chemical problems where these methods fail, fully quantum simulation a la Feynman might be the only viable approach.

In 2005, Aspuru-Guzik and coworkers [17] applied iterative phase estimation and other techniques from quantum information theory to the full CI problem. Although their approach scales polynomially for the full CI problem, the exact scaling of their algorihtm was unclear in 2005. However, their approach suggested that even modest quantum resources could potentially enable full CI simulations that outperform the largest, fastest super-

* rmuller@sandia.gov
† rjblume@sandia.gov

computers.

The first experimental demonstration of quantum full CI algorithm came 5 years later, when a photonic quantum information processor [18] calculated the ground and electronically excited states for a minimal basis set description of H_2 using 20-bit iterative phase estimation. Although this proof-of-principle computation did not provide any added insight into the nature of the H_2 bond, it demonstrated conclusively that the quantum phase estimation algorithm could produce accurate bonding and excitation energies – even in the face of the noise and decoherence inherent to imperfect physical qubits.

In this issue of ACS Nano., Wang and coworkers [19] demonstrate a quantum calculation of the ground and excited states for a HeH^+ molecule, which is isoelectronic with H_2, but has differently-charged nuclei. Wang et al. report the highest precision achieved to date in the quantum simulation of molecular energies; they surpass chemical precision by 10 orders of magnitude. Their quantum simulation was performed using two qubits from a diamond NV center, and represents the first implementation of the full CI algorithm on a solid-state qubit. As with the earlier demonstration [18], this result is most notable for verifying that these algorithms can be successfully implemented on actual qubits, rather than just in theoretical idealizations.

The principle of quantum chemistry simulation has been proved. The next urgent question is how it will scale – how many qubits and how much time will be required to apply quantum simulation algorithms to larger, more general molecules. The time requires scales with N, the number of basis functions used to describe the atomic orbitals that comprise the molecule (adequate basis sets require 5-20 basis functions per atom), and/or Z, the maximum nuclear charge in the molecule. The initial analysis last year [20] suggested that quantum simulation algorithms might require $\mathcal{O}(N^9)$ clock cycles. Although this is a huge advance, in-principle, over the $\mathcal{O}(e^N)$ scaling of exact classical simulation, it remains prohibitively intractable in practice. However, more careful analyses of the Suzuki-Trotter expansion have produced steady and rapid improvements in this scaling, first to $\mathcal{O}(N^7)$ [21], then to $\mathcal{O}(N^{5.5})$ [22], and, most recently, to $\mathcal{O}(N^3Z^{2.5})$ [23].

The best scaling known today suggests that, given a handful of good qubits, quantum simulation could produce practical, useful results. A closer look, however, suggests a less optimistic picture in the near future. Molecules with $N = 1000$ are routinely analyzed on laptop computers using density functional theory (DFT), the workhorse method of chemistry and materials science. The most optimistic scaling given above suggests that a quantum computer would need at least 10^9 operations to match what DFT can do on a laptop. Because qubits have far higher error rates than classical computers, such a large computation would absolutely demand quantum error correction [24]. Error correction imposes massive overhead in time, number of qubits, and complexity, because small quantum rotations have to be compiled into H, S, and T gates [25], some of which must be exhaustively distilled from noisy resources [26]. These considerations suggest that practical quantum simulation of meaningful molecules is substantially more challenging than it appears at first – and perhaps infeasible in the near term.

Perhaps surprisingly, we remain optimistic. Although the demonstrations by Wang et al [19] and others are a long way from practical utility, they demonstrate that the principle is sound. It is widely believed that further algorithmic improvements are possible – after all, just in the past two years we have seen the time scaling drop from $\mathcal{O}(N^9)$ to $\mathcal{O}(N^3Z^{2.5})$. Moderate improvements in scaling could dramatically change feasibility, and algorithms that avoid the Suzuki-Trotter expansion [27–30] appear promising. Finally, we observe that some of the most promising candidates for near-term "quantum supremacy" (practical speedups over existing classical computers) are robust quantum simulation algorithms that may not require error correction, either by using device noise to mimic real-world noise in the simulated system, or by leveraging shallow quantum circuits that run so quickly that errors do not accumulate. Analog quantum simulation [4] is one such candidate, and has been used to mimic Hubbard [31] and spin [32] Hamiltonians. Analog methods are not currently known for chemical or molecular systems, but these systems *can* be addressed within the variational eigensolver approach [33], which leverages a small quantum computer to evaluate the energy terms of a parametric wave function that is varied by an associated classical computer-driven optimization. We believe that between the near-term promise of these non-traditional algorithms, and steady progress toward the long-term goal of digital quantum simulation, quantum simulation of quantum chemistry has a bright future.

Sandia is a multiprogram laboratory operated by Sandia Corporation, a Lockheed Martin Company, for the United States Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under Contract DE-AC04-94AL85000. This document is the unedited Author's version of a Submitted Work that was subsequently accepted for publication in ACS Nano, copyright 2015 American Chemical Society after peer review. To access the final edited and published work see [34].

[1] Richard P Feynman. Simulating physics with computers. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 21(6-7):467–488, 1982.

[2] Peter Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: Discrete logarithms and factoring. *35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 124–134,

March 1994.

[3] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. *ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computation*, 96:212, 1996.

[4] I M Georgescu, S Ashhab, and Franco Nori. Quantum simulation. *Reviews Of Modern Physics*, 86(1):153–185, 2014.

[5] Stephen P Jordan, Keith SM Lee, and John Preskill. Quantum algorithms for quantum field theories. *Science*, 336(6085):1130–1133, 2012.

[6] A Yu Kitaev. Quantum measurements and the abelian stabilizer problem. *arXiv*, quant-ph/9511026, 1995.

[7] D Abrams and Seth Lloyd. Simulation of many-body Fermi systems on a universal quantum computer. *Physical Review Letters*, 1997.

[8] D Abrams and Seth Lloyd. Quantum algorithm providing exponential speed increase for finding eigenvalues and eigenvectors. *Physical Review Letters*, 1999.

[9] R Somma, G Ortiz, J Gubernatis, E Knill, and R Laflamme. Simulating physical phenomena by quantum networks. *Physical Review A*, 65(4):042323, 2002.

[10] P. Jordan and E. Wigner. About the Pauli exclusion principle. *Z. Phys.*, 47:631, 1928.

[11] CCJ Roothaan. New developments in molecular orbital theory. *Reviews Of Modern Physics*, 23:69–89, 1951.

[12] P Hohenberg and Walter Kohn. Inhomogeneous electron gas. *Physical Review B*, 136:B864, 1964.

[13] Walter Kohn and L J Sham. Self-consistent equations including exchange and correlation effects. *Physical Review*, 140:1133, 1965.

[14] P O Lowdin. Quantum theory of many-particle systems. I. Physical interpretations by means of density matrices, natural spin-orbitals, and convergence problems in the method of .... *Physical Review*, 1955.

[15] R J Bartlett. Many-body perturbation theory and coupled cluster theory for electron correlation in molecules. *Annual Review Of Physical Chemistry, Vol 61*, 1981.

[16] Jiri Cizek. On the correlation problem in atomic and molecular systems. calculation of wavefunction components in Ursell-type expansion using quantum-field theoretical methods. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 45(11):4256–4266, 1966.

[17] Alán Aspuru-Guzik, AD Dutoi, PJ Love, and Martin Head-Gordon. Simulated quantum computation of molecular energies. *Science*, 309(5741):1704–1707, 2005.

[18] B P Lanyon, J D Whitfield, G G Gillett, M E Goggin, M P Almeida, I Kassal, J D Biamonte, M Mohseni, B J Powell, M Barbieri, A Aspuru-Guzik, and A G White. Towards quantum chemistry on a quantum computer. *Nature Chemistry*, 2(2):106–111, February 2010.

[19] Ya Wang, Florian Dolde, Jacob Biamonte, Ryan Babbush, Ville Bergholm, Sen Yang, Ingmar Jakobi, Philipp Neumann, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, James D. Whitfield, and Jörg Wrachtrup. Quantum simulation of helium hydride cation in a solid-state spin register. *ACS Nano*, 2015.

[20] Dave Wecker, Bela Bauer, Bryan K Clark, Matthew B Hastings, and Matthias Troyer. Gate-count estimates for performing quantum chemistry on small quantum computers. *Physical Review A*, 90(2):022305, 2014.

[21] Matthew B Hastings, Dave Wecker, Bela Bauer, and Matthias Troyer. Improving quantum algorithms for quantum chemistry. *Quantum Information & Computation*, 15(1-2):1–21, 2015.

[22] David Poulin, M B Hastings, Dave Wecker, Nathan Wiebe, Andrew C Doherty, and Matthias Troyer. The Trotter step size required for accurate quantum simulation of quantum chemistry. *arXiv*, 1406.4920, June 2014.

[23] Ryan Babbush, Jarrod McClean, Dave Wecker, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Nathan Wiebe. Chemical basis of Trotter-Suzuki errors in quantum chemistry simulation. *Physical Review A*, 91(2):022311, February 2015.

[24] P W Shor. Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory. *Physical Review A*, 52(4):R2493, 1995.

[25] Alexei Yu Kitaev, Alexader Shen, and Mikhail N Vyalyi. Classical and quantum computation. American Mathematical Society, 2002.

[26] S Bravyi and A Yu Kitaev. Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas. *Physical Review A*, 71(2):022316, 2005.

[27] R. Cleve, D. Gottesman, M. Mosca, R. D. Somma, and D. Yonge-Mallo. In *Proceedings of the Forty-first Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '09*, pages 409–416, 2009.

[28] D. W. Berry, A. M. Childs, R. Cleve, R. Kothari, and R. D. Somma. *Physical Review Letters*, 114:090502, 2015.

[29] Ryan Babbush, Dominic W. Berry, Ian D. Kivlichan, Annie Y. Wei, Peter J. Love, and Alán Aspuru Guzik. Exponentially more precise quantum simulation of fermions I: Quantum chemistry in second quantization. *arXiv*, 1506.01020, 2015.

[30] Ryan Babbush, Dominic W. Berry, Ian D. Kivlichan, Annie Y. Wei, Peter J. Love, and Alán Aspuru Guzik. Exponentially more precise quantum simulation of fermions II: Quantum chemistry in the CI matrix representation. *arXiv*, 1506.01029, 2015.

[31] Markus Greiner, Olaf Mandel, Tilman Esslinger, Theodor W Hänsch, and Immanuel Bloch. Quantum phase transition from a superfluid to a Mott insulator in a gas of ultracold atoms. *Nature*, 415(6867):39–44, 2002.

[32] Axel Friedenauer, Hector Schmitz, Jan Tibor Glueckert, Diego Porras, and Tobias Schätz. Simulating a quantum magnet with trapped ions. *Nature Publishing Group*, 4(10):757–761, 2008.

[33] Alberto Peruzzo, Jarrod McClean, Peter Shadbolt, Man-Hong Yung, Xiao-Qi Zhou, Peter J Love, Alán Aspuru-Guzik, and Jeremy L O'Brien. A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor. *Nature Communications*, 5, 2014.

[34] Richard P. Muller and Robin Blume-Kohout. The promise of quantum simulation. *ACS Nano*, 2015.